

175 From Origen to Ephesus

Dominated by frame-works, Logos-sarx and Logos-anthropos
Development cannot be subsumed under these headings without remainder
Frameworks do not coincide with customary distinction between
Alexandria and Antioch; reality far more complicated
With possible exceptions of Greg Nyss and Nemesius, no deeper
recognition in fourth century of the real problem of christology,
how Christ could be one.

176 The relationship of Logos to sarx is analogous to the
relationship of body to soul in man. For the theologians of
the times this was the supreme example of the union of two
substances.

The Incarnation was the greatest expression of the
relationship of God to his creation. It was the task of fourth
century theology, in its christology, to preserve the transcendence
of God while still demonstrating the highest degree of his
immanence

The three main forms of Logos-sarx christology differ
considerably. Two of them are heretical: Arianism and
Apollinarianism. Both deny the human soul or nous in Christ.
Both assert that the Logos is conjoined with the sarx as
body and soul are conjoined in man. But for ~~the~~ Apollinarianism
The Logos is divine. For the Arians the Logos is a creature.

The third form of Logos-sarx christology is Athanasius.
In his writings the human soul of Christ does not play any
theological function. It may be a reality but it is over-
shadowed by the Logos.

While Apollinarianism is later than Arianism, Grillmeier
is inclined to believe that a latent Apollinarianism is earlier
than Arianism and indeed the source of Arianism. The
subject of Christ's sufferings fears prayers ignorance cannot
be the divine Logos, and so from a latent ~~Apollinarianism~~ Apollinarianism
there results an explicit Arianism.

Both Tertullian and Origen spoke explicitly of the human
soul of Christ. How was it that between Origen and Nicea
the doctrine of the soul of Christ became obscured?

177 Little doubt that the condemnation of Paul of Samosata, (AD 268) bp of Antioch, is a distinctive event in the history of christology. But the necessary critical conditions for its interpretation have not yet been achieved.

"Paul appears to have represented a divisive christology, and his opponents in the church, among whom the Presbyter Malchion played a leading role, a unitive christology. According to the Synodal Letter preserved in R part by Eusebius (HE 7 30), Paul denied the divinity of Christ which he had earlier allowed... According to witnesses of a later period (Contestatio Eusebii of 428, Timothy Aelurus, Severus of Antioch) Paul put forward a christology of the indwelling of the Logos in a man (with body and soul). Malchion on the other hand appears (178) to have put forward a christology the terminology of which had already progressed considerably. He saw in Christ a unity corresponding to the unity between body and soul in a human being. The Logos is in Christ what the soul is in a human being..."

From Malchion's viewpoint Paul's acknowledgement of a human soul in Christ implied a renunciation of a strict unity in Christ. In Paul himself it may have meant that the Word was in Jesus as the Spirit was in the prophets.

All this is hypothetical. Scholars are not agreed on the authenticity of the fragments witnessing to the events

178 What was happening in Origen's school of followers

There is no sign of a Logos-sarx christology in Gregory Thaumaturgus (ob 270), Dionysius of Alexandria (ob 264-5) Theognostus (writing between 250 and 280), and Pierius (writing 281/2-300). But Pierius's pupil Pamphilus in his Apology for Origen notes that some people find Origen's doctrine of a human soul in Christ a stumbling-block. Pamphilus remarks that the doctrine of the human soul comes not from Origen but from scripture.

179 A more or less pronounced Logos-sarx christology can be discerned in Methodius of Olympus (Altaner 242 f), in the so-called Adamantius (Altaner 244), in Alexander of Alexandria (309 f) teacher of Athanasius)

180 Eusebius of Caesarea, though an Origenist, upholds a christology within Logos-sarx framework. It tends to be a divisive christology to free the Logos from all suffering etc.